

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 10914 OF 2026

Ranjeet Bhattacharya and Ors. **...Petitioners**

V/s.

Divisional Joint Registrar and Ors. **...Respondents**

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (ST) NO. 24454 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 10914 OF 2026

Sun Beam High Estates Pvt Ltd. **...Petitioner**

V/s.

Ranjeet Bhattacharya and Ors. **...Respondents**

Mr. Karl Tamboly with Mr. *Zahan Setalvad*, Ms. *Vaishali Sanghavi*, Ms. *Vidhi Porwal*, Mr. *Pratik Shetty*, Ms. *Prachi Parmar* and Mr. *Ameet Mehta i/b M/s. Solicis Lex*, for Petitioners.

Mr. Mukesh Vashi, Senior Advocate with Mr. *Jaineel Vashi i/b M/s. M. P. Vashi and Associates*, for Interveneor.

Mr. A.C. Bhadang, AGP for Respondent-State.

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATED: 21 AUGUST 2026

P.C.:

1) The limited grievance raised in the present Petition is that the application for stay preferred by the Petitioners in pending revision filed

before the Hon'ble Minister (Co-operation) is not being taken up for hearing and decision. The Petitioners have suffered order dated 24 July 2026 passed by the Deputy Registrar appointing an Administrative Committee on the Society on account of lack of sufficient quorum. It appears that order dated 24 July 2026 was stayed by the Divisional Joint Registrar during pendency of the Appeal No. 262 of 2026. The Appeal, however, is dismissed on 13 August 2026. The Petitioners have preferred Revision against order dated 13 August 2026 before the Hon'ble Minister.

2) I have heard Mr. Tamboly, the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioners. It appears that a caveat has been filed by the Advocate Mr. Sunil Shukla on behalf of Respondent No. 3. Mr. Tamboly tenders an affidavit of private service of notice on Advocate Mr. Sunil Shukla. However, none has appeared on behalf of Respondent No. 3. Considering the nature of order that is proposed to be passed, in my view, it is not necessary to issue a formal notice to Respondent No. 3.

3) Mr. Bhadang, the learned AGP appearing for Respondent-State, on instructions, submits that the application for stay shall be decided by the Hon'ble Minister within a period of two weeks. It appears that certain precipitative actions are being taken by the Administrative Committee in relation to redevelopment of Society's building. In that view of the matter, *pro tem* arrangement needs to be made till the Revisional Authority decides the application for stay.

4) Accordingly, the statement made on behalf of the Revisional Authority that the application for stay shall be decided within a period of

10 days is recorded and accepted. Till the Revisional Authority decides the application for stay, the order dated 24 July 2026 passed by the Deputy Registrar shall remain stayed. The Revisional Authority shall, however, decide the application for stay on its own merits, without being influenced by the *pro tem* arrangement made by this Court. All contentions of the parties on merits are expressly kept open.

5) Parties shall appear before the Hon'ble Minister on 25 August 2026. The Petitioner to serve intimation of the date of hearing before the Hon'ble Minister to Respondent No. 3 by issuing letter to him.

6) The Writ Petition is accordingly **disposed of**. The Interim Application is also **disposed of**.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]